

shot in terms of heavy regulations in hand coming from Washington.

So we can all agree that we need to make the environment better for job creators and people who want to jump in and take risks. But the financial regulatory reform package that is being brought to the floor just as the Card Check bill that's still being spoken of around here, those are job killers. We ought to at least relieve the harm so that people we're relying on to create jobs can get back to work to do that. That was simply my point, Mr. Speaker.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would just note for the gentleman that 2.8 million Americans have lost their jobs since the passage of the majority's first stimulus bill; and the Nation's debt now stands at over \$12 trillion.

I thank the gentleman for his time, and I yield back.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2009

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

IMMIGRATION

(Ms. Clarke asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, just last week our Nation celebrated Thanksgiving. It was a time for families across this Nation to unite and reflect on the things we are grateful for.

This Thanksgiving I looked around my holiday table and admired the diversity of my family, many of whom are natural born citizens, some naturalized citizens, and some Jamaican immigrants. We are a blended family blessed with the realization of our own American dream. I realized that my story enjoys a certain similarity to the first Thanksgiving celebration. Native Americans breaking bread with Pilgrims. A blending of two different cultures, one immigrant, one native.

Like my family, many families across this Nation are a blend of many cultures and citizen status and are affected by our dysfunctional immigration system.

Mr. Speaker, immigration reform is too important to be delayed. As we prepare to debate immigration reform, I'm working with my colleagues to ensure access to the American Dream. Just like you, I, too, am the face of immigration; all of us coming together representing the diversity of this great Nation, the United States of America.

□ 1515

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE CIVILIAN SURGE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask: What happened to the civilian surge in President Obama's new strategy for Afghanistan? In his address to the Nation on Tuesday night, the President said that there are three parts to his Afghanistan strategy: a military effort, a civilian surge, and partnership with Pakistan. But while the President spoke at great length about the military effort and about Pakistan, he gave virtually no details about the civilian surge. In fact, he devoted only one sentence of his speech to it—a brief sentence about agricultural assistance.

Earlier this year, with great fanfare, the President unveiled his plans for a civilian engagement. He said it would help the Afghan people to rebuild their economy, infrastructure, education system, justice system, government, and civil society. I supported this policy because I believe that helping the Afghan people to improve their lives is the best way to defeat violent extremists. But it's now painfully obvious that the White House has all but forgotten about the civilian surge. It appears to have been lost in his plan to escalate the war with 30,000 more troops, which is deeply disappointing to me. But it's not the only reason why I oppose the escalation. I oppose it because the American people don't support it and can't afford it. In fact, America's military spending in Afghanistan alone next year will now exceed the entire official military budget of every other country in the world.

The escalation will also lead the Afghan people to see our troops as an occupying army, and the history of Afghanistan shows that the Afghan people will never accept a foreign occupation. As a result, the plan will boomerang because it will help the Taliban when they are recruiting for new members.

The escalation will also lead to more casualties of our troops and it will continue to stretch our military forces, which are already stretched much too thin. It will reduce the dwell time for our troops back home between deployments, placing even greater burdens on them and on their families.

The President's new strategy, Mr. Speaker, also doesn't include a realistic exit plan. The President talks about transferring responsibility for the war to Afghanistan within 18

months, but since there is very little chance that the Afghans will be ready by then, our troops are likely to be stuck for many, many years to come.

Finally, I'm disappointed in the President's plan because it continues to rely on the military option that has failed. At the same time, it ignores the far more effective alternative that is available to us. That alternative is smart security. Smart security calls for a strong emphasis on diplomacy, humanitarian aid, and economic development for the Afghan people. That is what will stabilize Afghanistan. That is what will win the hearts and minds of the Afghan people.

More broadly, smart security includes a comprehensive plan that would eliminate the root causes of extremism in Afghanistan and elsewhere. It dismantles existing networks of extremists, and it would stop the spread of nuclear and conventional arms around the world. I have proposed a smart security platform for the 21st century, Mr. Speaker, and it's in my bill, House Resolution 363. I invite every Member of the House to read it and to work with me to implement it.

Mr. Speaker, I'm as committed to defeating extremism in Afghanistan as anyone, and I do not believe that simply pulling our troops out of Afghanistan overnight is the right way to go. But I do believe that the Afghan people need political, economic, and social solutions for their problems. They do not need a military solution. That's why I will join with others throughout our Nation in the days ahead to oppose the escalation of this war and to urge the President to shift to smart security to make our Nation and the world a safer place.

GITMO AND YEMENI DETAINEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, in a speech at West Point earlier this week, President Obama explicitly designated Yemen as an emerging al Qaeda stronghold. The President stated, "Where al Qaeda and its allies attempt to establish a foothold—whether in Somalia or Yemen or elsewhere—they must be confronted by growing pressure and strong partnerships." How can the President reconcile these legitimate concerns about Somalia and Yemen while simultaneously releasing Guantanamo Bay detainees to these dangerously unstable countries?

Last month, the Obama administration secretly released another detainee to Yemen—information hidden from the American people under a provision in the FY 2009 spending bills explicitly prohibiting the disclosure of any information to the American people. If the American people knew who these detainees were, the acts of terror they have committed, or to which countries they were going to be released, they

would never stand for it. This is a dangerous precedent. Given that more than 74 Guantanamo detainees have returned to active terrorism, there's a real concern about the potential for these remaining detainees to return to a life of terror.

The American people deserve the facts. I encourage the public to visit The New York Times "Guantanamo Docket" Web site to review what scant information about these detainees was released by the previous administration. I know they will find these summaries deeply troubling.

Of the many unstable countries to which detainees may be sent, I'm most concerned about the impending release of 26 detainees to Yemen, a growing haven for al Qaeda in the Persian Gulf. It is my understanding that the administration is also preparing to release several other detainees to another country that anyone with a basic understanding of world affairs would agree is unacceptable. Unfortunately, this information, again, has been classified.

As the President acknowledged, Yemen is one of the most unstable countries in the world today, and a country where al Qaeda has reconstituted its operations over the last year. The director of the National Counterterrorism Center, Michael Leiter, stated in an October Voice of America interview, "In Yemen, we have witnessed the reemergence of al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula and the possibility that that will become the base of operations for al Qaeda."

A number of former Guantanamo Bay detainees have returned to Yemen to launch terrorist attacks, including one just 2 months ago. On October 13, Saudi police prevented an imminent suicide bomber attack as two al Qaeda terrorists slipped across the border from Yemen. One of these would-be suicide bombers, Yousef Mohammed al-Shihri, was a former Guantanamo detainee released in 2007 to Saudi Arabia. He quickly left Saudi Arabia for Yemen, where he rejoined al Qaeda.

In September 2008, another former Guantanamo Bay detainee, Said Ali al-Shihri, helped orchestrate the terrorist attack on the U.S. Embassy in Sana'a, Yemen, killing 10 guards and civilians. Since that time, al Qaeda's posture in Yemen has grown stronger with the merger of the Saudi and Yemeni arms of al Qaeda into one group—al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula—with Yemen as its base for training and operation. Yemen is also now home to the radical cleric Anwar al-Aulaqi, who influenced Fort Hood gunman Major Nidal M. Hasan and who U.S. intelligence believes to be a critical link to al Qaeda's efforts to radicalize Americans and Europeans.

I repeatedly urged the President to halt the release of detainees to dangerously unstable countries. It is counterintuitive, and dangerous, to return terrorist detainees to countries he acknowledges as al Qaeda sanctuaries.

If this administration is not prepared to show good judgment on this issue, this Congress must take action to provide oversight and reconsider these irresponsible decisions. But this Congress has yet to hold a single hearing to raise these concerns and demand answers from this administration.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better judgment from this administration and better oversight from this Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

U.N.'S MULTIPLE ANTI-ISRAEL RESOLUTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Sixty-two years ago, on November 29, 1947, the United Nations did something it should be very proud of. That day, the United Nations General Assembly voted overwhelmingly to authorize the creation of a Jewish state, paving the way for the founding of a democratic State of Israel 6 months later. But since then, the paths of the U.N. and Israel have diverged.

Israel's freedom, democracy, and prosperity are a model for the region and the world. The U.N., however, has abandoned its founding principles, has been manipulated and coerced by dictatorship after dictatorship, and has been plagued by corruption and mismanagement. Nowhere has the self-destructive, misguided path of the U.N. been more evident than in its bias towards Israel.

This week, instead of commemorating Israel's creation and celebrating its many achievements, the U.N. repeated its annual ritual of mourning Israel's existence by adopting six anti-Israel resolutions. As usual, it did so under the guise of its "International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People," celebrated the same day as that historic 1947 General Assembly vote to create a Jewish state. But where is the U.N.'s "International Day of Solidarity" with the people of Israel, who continue to be threatened by Hamas, Hezbollah, and other such militant groups; and by their state sponsors, Iran and Syria, who continue to pursue nuclear weapons and the missiles to deliver them? In the face of continued anti-Israel bias at the U.N., what has the United States done to stand up for our ally and fellow democracy?

This past April, Ambassador Susan Rice promised that the U.S. would be "fighting against the anti-Israel" rhetoric at the U.N. Unfortunately, this was easier said than done. The anti-Israel attacks at the U.N. are not an occasional diversion. They are relentless. They pervade the U.N., and they are not easily stopped.

An excellent case study in this bias is the U.N.'s response to Israel's conduct last winter of Operation Cast Lead, which was carried out to defend Israeli citizens from rocket and mortar attacks by Hamas and other violent extremist groups in Gaza. The Human Rights Council authorized a "fact-finding mission" with a prejudicial mandate to investigate Israel and only Israel. The mission released the so-called "Goldstone Report" that falsely accused Israel of deliberately attacking civilians, implicitly denied to Israel the right of self-defense, and recommended that the case be referred to the International Criminal Court. Despite the heralded U.S. membership and engagement in the Human Rights Council, that rogues' gallery adopted the report's recommendations and condemned Israel. But lest we forget, in the last year alone, the Human Rights Council has adopted seven anti-Israel resolutions and perpetuated a gross anti-Semitic assault through the Durban II Conference.

□ 1530

So it should not have come as a surprise that the Human Rights Council endorsed the Goldstone Report.

The General Assembly quickly followed suit. The U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights praised the Goldstone Report. Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon has promised to transmit the report to the U.N. Security Council, where only a U.S. veto stands in the way of further anti-Israel action. And the ICC prosecutor has announced that he is considering launching an investigation into Israel's conduct, even though Israel is not an ICC member state and has a robust, independent judiciary that is presently dealing with a number of cases raised.

These efforts to deny Israel its right of self-defense can—and will—be used to deny that same right to other free democracies, including the United States. Why do I say this? Well, the ICC prosecutor has already declared that he has jurisdiction over Afghanistan and is performing a preliminary investigation into U.S. and NATO operations in that country, which could lead to politically motivated prosecutions of American soldiers.

These are the stakes of the U.N.'s anti-Israel agenda. The "new era of engagement" and increased U.S. funding to the U.N. has not made a positive difference at all.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the U.S. to use our strongest leverage, the billions of taxpayer dollars that we contribute to the U.N. every year. It is time to cut off funding to the U.N. until it produces real, effective reform.